

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 11 and 20, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically on page 34. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,642,153 to Chaney, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Chaney") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394 to Schein, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Schein") and U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0078467 to Rosin, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Rosin") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,714 to Doganata, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Doganata").

Claims 5, 8, 15, 18, 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, Rosin and Doganata and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,226 to Sorensen, (hereinafter, merely "Sorensen").

Claims 9 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, Rosin, Doganata and Sorensen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,570 to Usui, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Usui").

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, Rosin and Doganata and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,497 to Ellis, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Ellis").

Claims 10, 19 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, Rosin and Doganata and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,563,648 to Menand, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Menand").

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"A television receiver comprising:...

a selection control device for controlling, when the information read out by said readout device is the program selection information, said selector based on the program selection information;

**wherein said selection control device, upon changing of a channel, executes a program associated with said channel."**  
(Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Chaney relates to a television system which includes circuitry for selecting a particular digital data transmission channel from a plurality of digital data transmission channels containing a desired digitally-encoded television program in

response to a control signal, at least one of the data transmission channels also including television program schedule data.

As understood by Applicants, Schein relates to a method which allows a viewer to retrieve, search, select and interact with television schedule information located in a remote database, computer network or on-line service.

As understood by Applicants, Rosin relates to an internet on-demand system for television which presents internet content and traditional television programming as part of a single interface. The system includes a server and a client capable of providing a dynamic graphical user interface. The system can display an internet gateway interface which actively scrolls through and highlights links to selected web pages which are organized according to templates corresponding to their content.

As understood by Applicants, Doganata relates to a method for a sender to locate and delete a piece of electronic mail after the mail has been sent.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chaney, Schein, Rosin and Doganata, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above features. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion of a television receiver comprising a selection control device wherein said selection control device, upon changing of a channel, executes a program associated with said channel, as recited in independent claim 1.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that not only does the combination of Chaney, Schein, Rosin and Doganata fail to teach or suggest the claimed features, but the combination is improper because there is no motivation, either in the references themselves, or from the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination is the result of improper hindsight using Applicants' claimed invention as a blueprint.

Furthermore, Sorensen, Usui, Ellis and Menand fail to cure the above described deficiencies of Chaney, Schein, Rosin and Doganata, as discussed above.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 11 and 20 are also believed to be patentable.

#### **IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800